

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on January 17, 2007.

Claims 1-3, 27, 31 and 32 are amended and claims 4-6 are canceled. Claims 10-26 were previously canceled and claims 7, 8 and 28-30 remain withdrawn. As a result, claims 1-3, 7-9 and 27-37 are now pending in this application.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 9, 27 and 31-37 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests the Office to consider the following.

The appropriate claims have been amended.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 27 and 35 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chason et al. (U.S. 2004/0118599). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), M.P.E.P. §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 4).

Claim 1 as amended includes some limitations taken from claims 36 and 37. The Office Action admitted that Chason does not teach these limitations. Vanfleteren does not teach the limitation of the independent claims as currently amended: “dispensing a polymer stress-relief layer upon a substrate lower surface under conditions to partially embed a ball grid array in excess of four electrical bumps.” Vanfleteren inserts material in the middle but does not partially embed the electrical bumps. Consequently, Chason does not anticipate claim 1 as amended.

Regarding claim 35, Chason does not teach any structure that remotely resembles the claim limitation of a peripheral ring.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chason et al. in view of Qi et al. (U.S. 6,774,497). Claim 9 was amended through amendment of independent claim 1.

Claim 31 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chason et al. in view of Tawata et al. (U.S. 5,570,506). Claim 31 was amended through amendment of independent claim 27.

Claims 32-34 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chason et al. in view of Danvir et al. (U.S. 6,821,878). Claim 32 was amended, and claims 33-34 were amended through amendment of independent claim 32.

Claims 36 and 37 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chason et al. in view of Vanfleteren et al. (U.S. 6,555,414). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (801) 278-9171 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

Respectfully submitted,

DAEWOONG SUH ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(801) 278-9171

By /


John N. Greaves
Reg. No. 40,362